UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,944	05/01/2007	Erik Berminge	47113-5094-00-US	2359
	7590 05/18/200 DDLE & REATH (DC)		EXAMINER	
1500 K STREE			ADDISU, SARA	
SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-1209			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/589,944	BERMINGE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SARA ADDISU	3724	

	SARA ADDISU	3724				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 May 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
 a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date 	of the final rejection					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be	filed within two month	e of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of power after (see NOTE below).	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause			
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better the application in the applicati	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/Boyer D. Ashley/	/Sara Addisu/					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3724	Examiner, Art Unit 3724 5/13/09					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to Applicant's response (page 9) that "Yankoff fails to disclose at least "a blade part" and a insert pocket formed in a front portion of the blade part.....However, Applicants do not see anything in the figures of Yankoff that meets the ordinary meaning of "blade part". Typical dictionary definition of "blade" includes something resembling a blade of a leaf such as the broad flattened part of an oar, paddle or fan. "Blade" in these definitions and comparisons is referring to the three dimensional shape having two opposing broad surfaces with a thin depth between them, and nor a two dimensional surface as apparently used by the Office Action to define a "blade part". In contrast to the blade part of the claims, Yankoff describes a support bar (14) with substantial thickness without two opposing brad surfaces separated by a depth.", Examiner respectfully points out that the limitations on which the applicant relies are not stated in the claims. Although these limitations are found as examples in the dictionary, they were not claimed explicitly or even defined as such in the Specification. A reading of the dictionary (or Specification) provides no evidence to indicate that these limitation must be imported into the claims to give meaning to disputed terms. Furthermore, Examiner asserts that reading the claims broadly, Yankoff's reads on the claim since the blade part is being defined by the Examiner as part (B) (i.e. the surface facing the Examiner defined "front" which includes part of (14) that is located just below the insert).